

**Remarks:**

In consideration of Section 112 objection to the claims and specification and objections to the drawings, the applicant has modified the claims 8 and 10, specification pages 6, and 10-15, and drawings of figures 2A, 2C, 3A and 3B to correct the errors therein. It is believed that the present application as amended should have met all of the requirements, and overcome the objections thereto.

However, the applicant traverses respectfully Section 103 (a) rejection because all of the references cited in the Official Action are published in 2002 or 2003, that is, after the filing date of April 18, 2001 of the present application. More particularly, the publication dates of U. S. Publication No. 2003/0069874 if Hertzog and U. S. Patent 6,374,259 to Celik et al are, respectively, April 10, 2003 and April 16, 2002.

Section 103 (a) states: A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Apparently, at the time the present invention was made none of the cited references, neither Hertzog nor Celik et al, has ever been published yet or become known to the public. Therefore, the cited references cannot constitute prior art to the present invention as disclosed and described in the present application. Accordingly, Section 103 (a) does not even apply here.

Further, neither Hertzog nor Celik et al discloses anything that would be identical with the present invention defined in claims 1 and 6. As the examiner stated, Hertzog does not teach transmitting an authorization code with the selected web card information to other users as defined in claims 1 and 6. Celik et al discloses a method and an apparatus for storing information in a computer system, but does not disclose the features of privacy control

system of the present invention as defined in claims 1 or 6. Therefore, neither Hertzog nor Celik et al can constitute a novelty bar to the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as defined in the claims of the present application must be novel and non-obvious in view of the cited references that do not even qualify as prior art. It is respectfully requested that the present application be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

5/11/2005  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant  
Jie Sha, Reg. No. 37503  
195 N. Harbor Drive, Suite 3504  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Tel. (312) 819-9770  
Fax: (312) 819-1963